

1

2 Q. ARE YOU THE SAME KAREN SASIC THAT HAS PREFILED DIRECT
3 TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE?

5 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR RESPONSIVE TESTIMONY IN THIS
6 PROCEEDING?

10 Q. WOULD YOU PLEASE ADDRESS THE CONCERNS OF THE PUBLIC
11 WITNESSES WHO TESTIFIED REGARDING SERVICE ISSUES AT THE NIGHT
12 HEARING IN THIS DOCKET HELD IN LAKE WYLIE ON DECEMBER 12, 2013?

Ms. Gauff testified that she had frequent billing problems. A review of Ms. Gauff's billing records indicates she contacted our office in February 2011 in regard to her January

1 30, 2011 bill in the amount of \$317.50. CWS investigated her concerns by re-reading the
2 meter to confirm it was accurate, which it was. In addition, CWS tested the water meter
3 which indicated 100% accuracy. CWS was unable to determine the cause of her increased
4 usage during the service period. Her usage dropped back down the following month to her
5 normal usage. The findings were reported to Ms. Gauff that her billing was accurate and
6 a payment arrangement was extended to her.

7 Our records indicate Ms. Gauff contacted our office in December 2013 regarding
8 her December 1, 2013 bill in the amount of \$178.05. CWS investigated her concerns and
9 determined the meter reading was in line with the billed meter read and there was not any
10 visible leak detected at the time of our representative visited the premise. Ms. Gauff was
11 informed of the findings. On December 30, 2013, Ms. Gauff filed a complaint with the
12 ORS in regard to the December bill. On January 6, 2014, Ms. Gauff's meter was tested for
13 accuracy. A representative for Ms. Gauff was present for the meter test. The meter tested
14 within the required standard for accuracy. A response was filed with the ORS informing
15 the billing was accurate along with a copy of the meter test conducted.

16 In both instances of high bill complaints, our investigation determined no billing
17 errors on the part of CWS. Confidential Exhibit KLS-1 contains the billing history of Ms.
18 Gauff from January 5, 2011 to January 6, 2014.

19 **William Morris, 16 Hummingbird Court, Lake Wylie**

20 Mr. Morris testified about a leak at his residence in September 2011 and two
21 additional leaks that have occurred at the base of his driveway.

22 Our records indicate in September 2011, Mr. Morris phoned to have the water
23 turned off due to a leak in his irrigation line. CWS responded by turning off the water as

1 requested until repairs could be made by Mr. Morris' plumber. In October 2011, Mr.
2 Morris requested a leak adjustment due to the lost water. As a courtesy, CWS provided a
3 wastewater credit adjustment in the amount of \$42.82 since the lost water did not enter into
4 the wastewater system.

5 In August 2012, Mr. Morris contacted the office reporting he had a leak that was
6 repaired by his plumber and was requesting a leak adjustment. CWS customer service
7 personnel reviewed the account and determined Mr. Morris was eligible for a wastewater
8 leak adjustment as the lost water due to the leak did not enter back into the wastewater
9 system. Mr. Morris was informed of the courtesy credit adjustment provided of \$7.13.

10 At the public hearing, Mr. Morris also complained about the water pressure at his
11 house being excessive. At Mr. Morris' request, CWS checked the water pressure of the
12 line serving his home on September 11, 2012, and found it to be within 80lbs to 95lbs per
13 square inch. However, even the levels cited by Mr. Morris, 115-120 lbs per square inch,
14 would be within the 125 pound per square inch limit set by the Commission S.C. Code
15 Reg. 103-774.

16 **Robert Lloyd, 22 Fairway Ridge Road, Lake Wylie.**

17 Mr. Lloyd testified about a leak in the cul-de-sac that affected 5 homes but which
18 he said resulted in service interruption to 500 homes. Our records do not indicate that Mr.
19 Lloyd has contacted CWS with any service issues, and I have so far been unable to identify
20 the incident to which Mr. Lloyd was referring.

21 **John Gauci, 2 Blackberry Lane, Lake Wylie**

22 Mr. Gauci complained of high bills. Our records indicate Mr. Gauci last contacted
23 our office in October 2011 in regard to a high bill issued on September 29, 2011 in the

1 amount of \$144.35. CWS personnel investigated his concerns by re-reading the meter to
2 confirm if it was accurate. It was determined the meter was misread at the time of billing
3 resulting in the incorrect, high bill. A corrected bill was issued in the amount of \$54.43
4 and an apology was extended to Mr. Gauci for the erroneous bill that was issued.

5 **Mr. Robert Hundley, 316 Ridge Reserve Drive, Lake Wylie**

6 Mr. Hundley was generally opposed to the rate increase, and also complained about
7 a high bill that he received when a backflow prevention device was installed incorrectly,
8 something he believed CWS should have noticed. Our records do not indicate that Mr.
9 Hundley has contacted CWS with any quality issues or billing complaints. Furthermore,
10 while CWS does require backflow devices to be installed on certain types of services, it
11 neither installs nor inspects the devices. The installation of a backflow device is the
12 responsibility of the customer. While one of our operators may have verified that Mr.
13 Hundley had a backflow device installed on his line, he would not have inspected the
14 installation.

15 Several other customers testified at the hearing, but did not identify specific
16 customer service issues. Those customers, who generally focused on the amount of the
17 rate increase and other matters unrelated to the company's quality of service, included:
18 Don Long, 14 Sunrise Point Ct., Lake Wylie; Jackie Harrington, 62 Fairway Ridge, Lake
19 Wylie; Ron Reid, 2 Weatherly Way, Lake Wylie; Pete Addison, 1734 Mineral Springs
20 Road, Lake Wylie; Lee Rowley, 96 Heritage Drive, Lake Wylie; Peggy Upchurch, 14
21 Sunrise Point Road, Lake Wylie, and James Cothran, 42 Honeysuckle Court, Lake Wylie,
22 and Perry Johnston, 5000 Lake Mist Drive. Ken Bozeman also testified regarding CWS's
23 method of calculating the bill for his restaurant, but his complaint is already the subject of

1 a separate pending complaint docket before the Commission, and I will defer to my
2 colleagues' testimony in that case to answer his concerns.

3 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

4 **A.** Yes.